

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/695,446	10/24/2000	Suzana Petanceska	0630/1G184-US1	2608	
32801	7590 02/10/2004		EXAM	INER .	
DARBY & DARBY P.C.			DI NOLA BARON, LILIANA		
P.O. BOX 52: NEW YORK,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615	10	
			DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004	,	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)
		09/695	,446	PETANCESKA ET AL.
Office Action Summary		Examir	er	Art Unit
		Liliana	Di Nola-Baron	1615
	The MAILING DATE of this common Reply	unication appears on	he cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMU ensions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this core period for reply specified above is less than thirty period for reply is specified above, the maximum ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply received by the Office later than three month ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	NICATION. ons of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no mmunication. (30) days, a reply within the s a statutory period will apply and ply will, by statute, cause the is after the mailing date of this	event, however, may a r statutory minimum of thin it will expire SIX (6) MON application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. SANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s)	filed on <u>29 December</u>	· <u>2003</u> .	
	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action is		
-		on for allowance exce	pt for formal matt	ters, prosecution as to the merits is 0. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposit	tion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>7-19 and</u> Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-6,20-25 and 31-33</u> is/a Claim(s) is/are objected to Claim(s) are subject to res	<u>d 26-30</u> is/are withdra re rejected.		ration.
	tion Papers		•	
	The specification is objected to by			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/a			
	Applicant may not request that any ol			
				(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
	The oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examiner.	Note the attache	d Office Action of form F10-132.
-	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			C 440(a) (d) as (6)
a) * 13)□ 14)□	since a specific reference was inclu 37 CFR 1.78. a)	f: ity documents have to the comments have to the priority documents have to the priority documents have to the comment of the comment of the comment of the first senter that the comment of the comment of the comment of the first senter that the priority has been domestic priority of the comment of the co	een received. een received in A ments have been Rule 17.2(a)). ertified copies not under 35 U.S.C. nce of the specific application has b under 35 U.S.C.	Application No received in this National Stage received. § 119(e) (to a provisional application cation or in an Application Data Sheet
Attachme	nt(s)		<u>,</u>	
2) Not	ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1448	v (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/695,446 Page 2

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-6 and 20-25 in Paper No. 18 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the restriction requirement was submitted almost three years after filing of the application, and the subject matter of pending claims 1-30 has already been searched and examined on the merits. This is not found persuasive because inventions I, II and III are unrelated, have different modes of operation and different effects. Group I is directed to a method of reducing a level of amyloid-β in vivo, Group II relates to a diagnostic method in vitro, and Group III is drawn to a method of testing in vivo. The inventions are distinct and have a separate status in the art.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL. Claims 1-6, 20-25 and 31-33 will be examined in this office action. Claims 7-19 and 26-30 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-6, 20-25 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Notelivitz et al. (U.S. Patent 6,524,616).

Application/Control Number: 09/695,446

Art Unit: 1615

The 102(e) date of the reference is the earliest U.S. filing date for which a benefit is properly sought via § 119(e) and/or 120. The earliest filing date of U.S. Patent 6,524,616 is June 25, 1999, which is prior to the filing date of the provisional application, to which the instant application claims benefit.

The patent provides a method for treating or retarding neurodegeneration and cognitive decline and dysfunction associated with Alzheimer's disease (AD), aging and other dementia disorders, said method comprising administering compositions comprising mammalian estrogen (See col. 1, lines 15-26 and col. 10, lines 55-60). With regard to claims 1, 2 and 20, the patent teaches that estrogen reduces the deposition of β-amyloid in the brain (See col. 12, lines 53-67). The amount of mammalian estrogen in the compositions disclosed by the patent is 0.2-2.0 mg, which is in the amount range claimed by Applicant in claims 31 and 33, and the patent teaches estradiol, specifically 17-β estradiol, and conjugated equine estrogens (CEE) as estrogen used in the method of the invention (See col. 10, line 60 to col. 11, line 2), as claimed in instant claims 3, 4, 21 and 31-33. The method disclosed by the patent, which comprises administering the same compounds claimed by Applicant in the same amount ranges, has inherently no effect on soluble APP levels, as claimed in instant claims 1 and 20.

With respect to claims 5, 6 and 25, since the method and compositions disclosed by the patent and those claimed by Applicant are the same, and the compositions in both the patent and the instant application are administered to patients affected by or at risk of developing AD, the amyloid- β peptides are inherently the same and the method inherently reduces the ratio of A β 42 to A β 40.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/695,446

Art Unit: 1615

Regarding claim 22, the patent teaches that rats were fed with estradiol diet for 10 months (See Example 1, col. 15, lines 28-49). With respect to claim 23, the patent teaches that all routes of administration of the compositions may be used, and includes pills, capsules and tablets, with acceptable carriers (See col. 13, lines 33-43). With regard to claim 24, the method disclosed by the patent is directed to treat dysfunctions associated with AD (See col. 1, lines 15-26).

The method and compositions disclosed by Notelivitz et al. meet the limitations of claims 1-6, 20-25 and 31-33 of the instant application, as the patent provides methods to reduce the level of amyloid-β comprising administering estrogen. Thus, the patent anticipates the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, filed on January 3, 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-30 have been fully considered and are persuasive, since the prior art is directed to methods affecting the expression and synthesis of APP. Therefore, the rejections of record have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the newly found prior art.

Conclusion

5. Claims 1-6, 20-25 and 31-33 are rejected.

Application/Control Number: 09/695,446

Art Unit: 1615

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liliana Di Nola-Baron whose telephone number is 571-272-0592. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:30AM-7:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-1234/1235.

Lanos

January 29, 2004

THURMAN K. PAGE SUPERVISORY HATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600